

4.2.12(u)

BAPTISM

AN INDISPENSABLE



PRE-REQUISITE

TO

COMMUNION AT THE LORD'S TABLE.

BY WILLIAM NEWMAN.

LONDON:

Printed by James Cundee, Ivy-Lane,

AND SOLD BY BUTTON, PATERNOSTER-RROW; WILLIAMS
AND SMITH, STATIONERS'-COURT; AND
TAYLOR, MILE-END.

1805.

Price Six-pence.

BAPTIST



1870

THE BAPTIST CHURCH

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

MINUTES

OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Held at New York City

1870

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Baptismal controversy has of late been renewed by the appearance of two pamphlets, and therefore, the Baptists, as usual, must act upon the defensive.

The writer of the following pages has assigned his reasons for thinking that unbaptized persons, should be refused admission to the Lord's Table. The subject has been frequently discussed, yet, plain as it is, he apprehends that it is but little understood, by a large multitude of those who profess godliness. He has no desire to stir up strife and wrath, but to promote the interests of peace, by a plain statement of truth. For he sincerely believes, that many of those who clamorously denounce the conduct of the Baptists as unkind and uncharitable, unjust and unscriptural, would renounce their censures, or, at least, moderate them, if they calmly considered the grounds of our practice.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Of Mr. BOOTH's "Apology for the Baptists," which is replete with argument and with pleasantry, the writer has made a free use: but not without full permission from the venerable author.

The profits of this pamphlet (if any) will be devoted to the Baptist-Education-Society, established in London, 1804, to assist young men in their preparation for the work of the ministry.

Bromley, near Bow, Sept. 10, 1805.

BAPTISM,

&c. &c.

BAPTISM, and the Lord's Supper, are the two positive ordinances of the New Testament œconomy. We are under the most solemn obligations to keep them, as they were delivered to us by the apostles of the Messiah. But many Christians, when speaking of the Lord's Supper, denominate it *the ordinance*, as if there were but one ritual institute binding upon us—however, from the beginning, it was not so. “The distinction between positive law and moral law,” says Dr. FIDDES, “is founded in this difference: the subject-matter of positive law is something to which we are antecedently under no obligation, and which only obliges by virtue of its being enacted, and, perhaps, to a certain limited period. The subject-matter of moral law is, on the other hand, something antecedently in the visible reason of it, obligatory to us, and the obligation thereof will always continue unchangeably the same. By a positive command, I understand an *express* declaration

made by competent authority, whether concerning things to be done, or to be omitted." See Mr. BOOTH'S *Pædobaptism Examined*, ed. ii. vol. i. p. 3. The law of baptism is of perpetual obligation, for the ministers of Christ may expect his promised presence in the administration of it, as well as in preaching the word, to the end of the world. Nor can it be doubted that Christians will continue in partaking the sacred supper, to "shew forth the Lord's death, *till he come*." "In a positive institution," says Bishop TAYLOR, "God will be so perfectly obeyed, that he will not be disputed with, or enquired of *why*, and *how*, but just according to the measures there set down---*so, and no more, and no less, and no otherwise*." Ductor Dub. b. ii. ch. iii. § 14, 18. The will of the law-giver, is the sole reason for obedience. The goodness or fitness of the thing itself, which is required, is out of the question: much less does our obligation to obey a positive institute result from our seeing the reason of it, but from the command of God only. Divine authority, which is no other than the right of God to command, or to prohibit, is all in all. Hence it appears, that there is a wide difference, and a just distinction between positive and moral precepts. Yet it is true that our obligation to regard positive precepts, is a moral obligation; for the moral law binds us to obey the whole will of God, in all manner of obedience---binds us to all that, which in any way of discovery, God has made known to be our duty. It is freely admitted that positive institutions are not so important, *in themselves considered*, as the precepts of the moral law. We are at no loss which to prefer, when a preference is to be shewn; for God will have *mercy*, and not *sacrifice*."---Let every thing stand in its own place. We must be careful to avoid extremes: diminutive and disparaging things have been said on the one hand, and extravagant things on the other. Bishop BUTLER has remarked, that "it is one of the peculiar weaknesses of human nature, when

upon a comparison of two things, one is found to be of greater importance than the other, to consider this other as scarce of any importance at all." Analogy of Religion, p. ii. ch. i. Surely a genuine disciple of Christ will never think it a matter of indifference, whether the laws of Christ be regarded or not; he will as soon question whether his saviour should be *believed* in what he declares, as whether he should be *obeyed* in what he commands. Lord BACON has well observed, that "the prerogative of God comprehends the whole man, and is extended as well to the *reason* as to the *will* of man; that is, that man renounce himself wholly, and draw near to God. Wherefore, as we are to obey his law, though we find a reluctance in our will; so we are to believe his word, though we find a reluctance in our reason: for if we believe only that which is agreeable to our reason, we give assent to the matter, not to the author, which is no more than we would do towards a suspected and discredited witness. Sacred theology is grounded on, and must be deduced from the oracles of God, and not from the light of Nature, or the dictates of reason---TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Advancement of Learning*, p. 468, 469.

These observations are premised as an introduction to what follows, because the greater part of what has been said in defence of free communion, is grounded either upon ignorance of the true nature of positive institutions, or proceeds from inadvertency and inattention to their import and authority. To almost every thing that is pleaded in defence of the practice here opposed, it would be a sufficient reply to say---*Baptism and the Lord's Supper are positive institutions.*

We now proceed to shew cause why free communion

should not be admitted, and then to offer a short refutation of the common pleas which are made in its favour. The case stands thus :---Some few of the churches of Christ, of the baptist denomination, admit those believers to communion with them at the Lord's table, whom they themselves consider, and must on their own principles consider, as unbaptized. Against this practice lie the following objections :

I. It is inconsistent with the *precepts of Christ*---“Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world. Amen.” Mat. xxviii. v. 19, 20. Here the command is, first, to teach; secondly, to baptize; then to lead the baptized believer into an acquaintance with all the doctrines and discipline of the house of God. Now, “a limited commission, includes a prohibition of such things as are not contained in it, and positive laws imply their negative.” Our great legislator here, therefore, tacitly prohibits every unbaptized person having communion at his table. Thus it appears, that the *order of words* in the commission, requires baptism, to precede the participation of the Lord's supper. The *order of time* shews the same thing. Baptism had the priority in point of institution. Great multitudes were baptized by John, and by the twelve apostles, before there was any authority for eating bread and drinking wine as an ordinance of divine worship---before the sacred supper was heard of, or had an existence.

II. It is inconsistent with *apostolical examples*. “Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of

bread, and in prayers," Acts ii., 41, 42. Here we have first, faith; secondly, baptism; thirdly, church-fellowship. Was not this order expressive of the mind of Christ, and designed as a model for all succeeding churches, in all succeeding ages? Why should we not continue in the apostles' fellowship, as well as in their doctrine? Why should we break in upon such beautiful order as this? Has Jesus countermanded his first precepts, or have we learned from Heaven that the practice of the Apostles and primitive Christians is not in these things to be imitated? Look at the religious profession of the blessed Paul: he first believed, then was baptized, and after that, assayed to join himself to the disciples, Acts ix. 18, 26. There is not the least reason to think that any one was ever received into those primitive churches, without being first baptized. Thus Dr. DODDRIDGE: "It is certain that Christians in general have always been spoken of, by the most ancient fathers, as baptized persons: and it is also certain, that as far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity reaches, no unbaptized person received the Lord's Supper." Lectures, vol. ii. p. 371.

III. It tends to the abolition of both the ordinances. First, as to baptism: It is evident that a believing Quaker may be received into communion on the same ground with a believing Pædobaptist—the claim of the one, is as good as the claim of the other, because infant baptism is no baptism at all.* But, if once it be admitted that an attention to real baptism is an indifferent thing, unnecessary, and unessential to church-communion, many will be strongly tempted wholly to

* Let the reader recollect, that the persons to whom I advert, the advocates of free-communion, admit this fully in theory, as professed baptists, though in their practice they seem to deny it.

omit it, rather than suffer the reproach with which it is attended. There are too many already, who say, "Why, as to baptism, it is not essential; we can go to Heaven without it, if we believe in Christ: baptism cannot make us better Christians than we are." Shall we encourage this ignorance, and this indifference? Again, as to the Lord's supper: If baptism may be given up, why not this also? Suppose a person made a credible profession of repentance and faith, to a church established on the principles of free communion, and desired to unite with them, but refused to partake of bread and wine; could that church, on its own principles, consistently reject him?—certainly not. Now, if one ordinance may be given up, why not both? Let us pause, and consider.

Are they not both appointments of the same Lord—intended for the same persons—of equal continuance in the Christian church, and alike required of proper subjects? How comes it to pass that baptism should be so degradingly spoken of, by those who practise free communion? Is it not much more frequently mentioned in the New Testament, than the sacred supper? Are not repenting and believing sinners often exhorted to it? Are there not many exhortations given to professing Christians, on the ground of their being baptized? Does not the Holy Spirit commend them that were baptized by John, as "justifying God," while he severely censures others, "as rejecting the counsel of God against themselves," because they slighted the solemn appointment? Is it not deserving attention, that "Baptism is a divine institution, to which a believer submits but *once*, in which respect it greatly differs from every other appointment under the Christian œconomy?" Was there not a glorious proof exhibited of the doctrine of the Trinity at the baptism of Jesus, and does it not appear that the perpetuity of baptism, will ensure the perpetuity of the doctrine of the Trinity, as the sacred supper

does that of the doctrine of the atonement? A power to dispense with Christ's ordinances, was never given to any man, or to any church upon earth. It becomes us, then, to revere the legislative character of Him who is King in Zion, and to beware of seeming to invade the honors of his crown. Many professors are for "Christ and no ordinances—Christ, and no order"—but shall we praise them in this?—We praise them not.

IV. The practice of our free-communion brethren, "makes our separation from the established church, look more like a piece of obstinacy, than a case of conscience. What, shall we boggle at reading the common prayer-book, wearing the surplice, kneeling at the Lord's supper, &c. and can at once drop an ordinance of Christ?"—This looks like straining at gnats, and swallowing camels. Certainly, if we can connive at what we ourselves consider as a human invention, we have little reason to scruple the lawfulness of subscribing the articles of the church of England. Now it seems that those writers, who have appeared in vindication of our national establishment, have not been ignorant of their advantage over such protestant dissenters as proceed on the principle here opposed. Thus Dr. WHITBY: "If, notwithstanding the evidence produced that baptism by *immersion* is suitable, both to the institution of our Lord and his apostles, and was by them ordained to represent our burial with Christ, and so our dying unto sin, and our conformity to his resurrection by newness of life, as the apostle doth clearly maintain the meaning of that rite; I say, if, notwithstanding this, all our [Pædobaptist] dissenters do agree to *sprinkle* the baptized infant, why may they not as well submit to the significant ceremonies imposed by our church? For, since it is as lawful to *add* unto Christ's institution a significant ceremony, as to *diminish* a significant ceremony which He or his Apostles instituted, and use another in its stead, which they never

did institute, what reason can they have to do the *latter*, and yet refuse submission to the *former*? And why should not the *peace* and *union* of the church, be as prevailing with them to perform the one, as is their *mercy* to the infant's body to neglect the other?" Protestant Reconciler, p. 289. On which Mr. BOOTH justly remarks, that "if this learned writer had been addressing those dissenters who practise free communion, his argument would have had superior force. Because our dissenting Pædobaptist brethren believe that infant sprinkling is *real* baptism, and practise it as having the stamp of Divine authority; whereas, those dissenters with whom we are now concerned, believe no such thing. They consider it as a human invention, and yet receive pædobaptists into their churches as if they were rightly and truly baptized, according to the command of Christ." Apology, page 67. ed. Philadelphia.

V. Free communion is most certainly an innovation. Where was it before the days of Jessey and Bunyan? Ecclesiastical antiquity knows it not. Ask any of the churches of Christ concerning it, from the apostles' days down to the reformation, and much lower; their reply would be, in the declaration of Paul, "We have no such custom; neither the churches of God" that were before us. But, our persuasion concerning the necessity of baptism as a term of communion, has had the sanction of universal belief, and universal practice, for more than seventeen hundred years. To receive an unbaptized person into communion, was never once attempted; so far as appears, among all the corruptions of the church of Rome. Further: In all the catechisms and confessions of faith that have been published at any time, by any denomination of Christians, "if the positive institutions of Christ be not entirely omitted, baptism is not only always mentioned first, but generally in such a way as intimates that it is a pre-re-

quisite to the Lord's table. And so, even in our common forms of speaking, if we have occasion to mention both those solemn appointments of our Lord, baptism still has the priority."

VI. Our free-communion brethren, in this particular, are, as baptists, grossly inconsistent with themselves. The very arguments which they use to defend free-communion, they oppose and disown when pleading against pædobaptism. In the latter case, they insist upon obedience to positive law; in the former, they argue upon moral considerations, fitness, expediency, &c. Thus, their treatment of one ordinance very much differs from their treatment of the other. But are they not both positive institutions, and derived from the same authority? "In truth, mixed communion appears most shapelessly and ridiculously informal to many of the pædobaptists themselves. Here, says one some time ago, is a man brought into a Christian church, whom you think unbaptized. In time, perhaps, he becomes a baptist, and is baptized. Then you do in effect cast him out of the Christian church, and receive him in again by baptism; for how can a man be of the church of Christ, that is, professedly a Christian, unless he be baptized?"

But let us listen to the advocates of the practice here opposed.

I. They quote passages of scripture, such as these:—"Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations—for God hath received him. Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God. God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."

Rom. xiv., 1, 3. and xv. 7.—Acts xv. 8, 9.—1 Cor. ix. 19, 23. On these passages of holy writ, we make three remarks. First, they do not so much as mention either baptism, or the Lord's supper, nor appear to have the least reference to either of them. Secondly, whatever their meaning may be, if they do not grant a *dispensing power* to gospel ministers and churches, they will not serve the purpose for which they are adduced. Thirdly, several of them were addressed to churches, *as such*: to those who were members of churches already, and, therefore, cannot be understood relative to their being admitted to fellowship. It is urged upon us again and again, "God hath received them," and why should not we? The reply is, "a sovereign Lord may do what he pleases himself, but his servants must act according to his orders"

II. 'All the saints shall for ever dwell in glory together.' Who denies it? It is admitted that there are many unbaptized persons in heaven. What then? "We are not to take our measures of acting in Christ's church here below, from what he himself does in Heaven, but from those rules which he has left us on earth to go by." We readily grant, that true believers of *all* denominations, whether they be protestants, catholics, or members of the greek church; whether they be baptists, pædobaptists, or katabaptists, shall all be happy together in Heaven. But shall we hence conclude, that they may all unite at the Lord's table? What! must we receive to communion converted catholics, who refuse the *wine* at the holy supper, and converted quakers who utterly reject baptism, because we hope to be happy with them in heaven! Moses and the prophets might hope to enjoy Heaven with many that were not circumcised, but were they warranted by that hope to admit any males to communion with them in the passover, or the sanctuary service, before they were circumcised? Baptism and the Lord's supper are

divine appointments *as much of a positive kind*, as circumcision and the passover; and surely we are as much obliged to regard the former, in the manner and order revealed, as the Jews were to regard the latter.

III. 'Why do you admit pædobaptists to your pulpits?' The nature of the case is different, and the difference is obvious. "Public preaching is not confined to persons in a *church-state*, nor ever was; but the Lord's supper is a church-ordinance, nor ought ever to be administered but to a particular church, *as such*."

IV. 'Is not a pædobaptist able to fill up his place, and perform the duties of a member with you?' Yes; and so is a converted Turk, Heathen, or Jew. God is no respecter of persons. "It is no matter where a man was born, or how he was educated; whether he drew his first breath at Constantinople, or Pekin, or London; whether his parents taught him to revere the koran of Mahomet, the institutes of Confucius, or the well-attested Revelation of God; if he really be born of the spirit, he has an equal claim to all the privileges of a gospel church, with a true convert descended from Christian ancestors. And if so, while our brethren abide by their present hypothesis, they could not refuse the sacred supper to the one any more than the other, without the most palpable inconsistency, though, by admitting the former to that divine appointment, they would surprize and offend all that heard of it."

V. 'What you say may do very well in a town where there is a baptist as well as an independent church; but in those places where there is only the latter, must the baptists be deprived of the Lord's supper.' To this it is replied:

(1.) There is but one Bible for town and country.

(2.) If a Christian cannot celebrate the death of Christ in that way which he himself considers to be acceptable to his Lord and master, he must wait till he can, shewing at once his reverence for the statutes of Heaven, in that case made and provided, and his submission to the disposals of an infinitely wise providence.

(3.) If the law must bend to local circumstances, and not rather circumstances to the law, shall we not open a door wide enough to admit all the superstitions of popery?

“That it is better to omit a positive ordinance than to perform it contrary to divine appointment, pædobaptists themselves assure us.” Thus the famous BUDDEUS:—‘Persons who cannot drink wine had better entirely abstain from the sacred supper, than receive it under one species only.’ DEYLINGIUS:—‘It is better entirely to abstain from using the holy supper, than receive it contrary to the appointment of Christ. Mr. BLAKE:—‘Omissions seem better to me than a prohibited, or a disorderly proceeding, expressly against a command or ordinance of Jesus Christ. The ark had better stayed where it was, than a new cart should have carried it in that disorder to the place appointed for it. Better that Saul and Uzziah had let sacrifice alone, than any to whom it did not appertain should have undertaken it. I never saw sufficient reason given that a man should break an express rule, rather than omit a duty of mere positive institution. Jeroboam must rather have no sacrifice, than that Dan and Bethel should be the place for it.’ Mr. BRADBURY:—‘It is better, I think, to leave such a duty [as baptism] undone, than not to have it well done. God never expects it either from you or me, when he has thrown a bar in our way, that we should break it, or leap over it.’ In Pædobapt. Exam. ed. ii. vol. ii. p. 311, 312.

VI. 'Then you will sometimes refuse a better man than him that is received.' So Mr. BUNYAN:—'Take two Christians equal in all points but this; nay, let one go beyond the other far for grace and holiness, yet this circumstance of water shall drown and sweep away all his excellencies, not counting him worthy of that reception that with hand and heart shall be given a novice in religion, because he consents to water. Works, vol. i. p. 143. So Mr. PETER EDWARDS:—'The most pious and useful persons, suppose Mr. Whitefield, Mr. Hervey, Lady Huntingdon, or Lady Ann Erskine, would no more have obtained a place at the Lord's supper among them, than the most abandoned and profligate of the human race.' Baptism, p. 19.

Are we then in the administration of a positive institute, to be governed by an imaginary moral scale of degrees? Or can any one point out the chapter and verse where the degrees of moral qualification are marked as on a graduated scale,—where we are told that all believers must attain to such a point of eminence before they are admitted? Is not this setting up a rule of our own invention, when God hath already given us our rule? Does not the New Testament encourage believers to apply for baptism, and the Lord's supper as soon as they become believers?

Further:—In days of old, when the law of circumcision was in force, and was considered as a necessary pre-requisite for the paschal supper, suppose that such men as *Enoch* and *Noah*, *Melchizedeck* and *Job*, being uncircumcised, had applied for communion with the church of Israel, would not Moses have refused them?—and if he had refused, would it have been just to imagine that on that account he considered them as on a level with 'the most abandoned and profligate of the human race.'—Would Mr. Peter Edwards himself admit any one of the celebrated characters he mentions, (who were con-

fessedly some of the most pious and useful persons that have adorned this country) *if he considered* the person applying as *unbaptized*? If he would, then, in that instance he renounces baptism altogether, and if so, why has he published two tracts on the subject? But, if he would not, then, why this vile insinuation? What reason has he to censure the baptists for doing what his own conduct justifies? "Thou art inexcuseable . . . for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, for thou that judgest doest the same things."

VII. 'Baptism is not a saving ordinance.' Very true; but is it to be disregarded on that account? The Lord's supper is not a saving ordinance, shall we then refuse to partake of it any more? The Lord's day is not a saving ordinance, shall we then be justified in breaking the sabbath? While we abhor the thought of putting any thing in the place of our Saviour's atoning blood, and the purifying grace of the Holy Spirit, still we must remember, JESUS hath said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

VIII. 'Strict communion is a narrow-soul'd piece of business.'

Answer. There is not much latitude of charity in such an objection, especially in the manner in which it is generally stated. But, alas! the baptists are a "sect every where spoken against." It should be remembered, however, that the Lord's supper was not appointed to be a *test* of brotherly love among the people of God. That mutual Christian affection should there be exercised is certain, and so it should in all other branches of social religion. "As to a *proof*, a *substantial proof* of our love to the children of God, it is not given at so cheap and easy a rate as that of sitting down with them, either occasionally or statedly, at the holy table. The *true test* of our love to the disciples of

Christ, is not a submission to any particular ordinance of public worship; for that is rather an evidence of love to God, and reverence for his authority; but sympathizing with them in their afflictions, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and taking pleasure in doing them good, whatever their necessities may be." We cordially invite pædobaptist Christians, of private or public character, to our own tables, because they are our own tables, but we do not invite them to the Lord's table, *because it is the Lord's table, and not our own.* But we are doomed to the hard fate of being called *bigots*, because we dare not violate our consciences,—because we dare plead for the laws of Christ,—because we cannot countenance the neglect of them,—because we cannot connive at infant-sprinkling, which our free-communion brethren, as well as ourselves, professedly consider as a mere human invention,—a part and pillar of popery,—an invention that exposes Christianity to the ridicule of the infidel,—a corruption of divine worship, which has also been the occasion, in numberless instances, of corrupting the doctrines of Christ, and hardening the consciences of the profane to a degree awfully dangerous. See the Evangelical Magazine for September, 1805, p. 418, 419. If the reader think this language unreasonably severe, Bishop BURNET shall remind him that, "whatever moderation or charity we may owe to men's *persons*, we owe none at all to their *errors*, and to that frame which is built on and supported by them." There are many pædobaptists in London and in the country, whose talents and learning the writer admires, whose piety and zeal he desires to imitate, and whose cordial friendship he highly prizes; but, nevertheless, he cannot think well of pædobaptism. Must we then be called bigots, because we maintain consistency, which is allowed on all hands to be the best evidence of sincerity? a consistency in which we are confirmed by the judgment and practice of all the

churches of Christ in the whole world, except those few which plead for free communion; for all the churches of every age, of every nation, of every name, seem to agree in this, be their sentiments or modes of worship what they may in regard to other things, to admit none to the sacred supper who have not been, *in their opinion*, baptized. Hear Dr. WALL, a learned pædobaptist:—*“No church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized;—among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that, that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized.”* Hist. Infant. Bapt. Part. II. ch. ix.

Does true Christian candour require any man to sacrifice one jot or tittle of divine truth by way of complaisance to his neighbour? Or must we violate our fidelity to God, in order to prove our love to the brethren? The fact is, latitudinarianism, not bigotry, is the sin of the age. The character of a bigot is well drawn by Mr. FULLER:—“Bigotry,” says he, “if I understand it, is a blind and inordinate attachment to one’s own opinions. If we be attached to principles on account of their being our’s, or because we have adopted them, rather than because they appear to us to be taught in the Holy Scriptures; if we be attached to *some* peculiar principles to the neglect of *others*, or so as to give them a greater proportion in the system than they require; if we consider things as being of greater importance than the Scriptures represent them; if we adhere so obstinately to our opinions as to be averse to free inquiry, and not open to conviction; if we make so much of principles as to be inattentive to holy practice; or if a difference in religious sentiment destroy or damp our benevolence to the persons of those from whom we differ; in any of these cases we are subject to the charge of bigotry.” *Calvinistic and Socinian Systems examined*, &c. let. x. That there are real bigots among

the baptists will be granted ; and so there are in every other community. Let that denomination that is free cast the first stone.

The writer apprehends it is no sin to belong to a party, for *that* unavoidably results from the exercise of private judgment, and the tendency to union in kindred minds ; but to indulge a party-spirit is unquestionably a sin ; for to indulge a *party-spirit* is universally understood to mean something inconsistent with the law of love. It is to pay that kind or degree of respect to a part, which is inconsistent with a just regard to the good of the whole. Those who profess to belong to no party, seem to be little aware that *they are themselves a party*. They have some very respectable leaders, and they are the *anti-sectarian sect*. Under that title they should appear in all future editions of Miss Hannah Adams's *View of all Religions*, edited by Mr. Fuller.

The age of implicit faith being past, let every man on every religious subject think for himself, and be fully persuaded in his own mind. Let every one act upon conviction, and maintain firmly, but temperately, what his judgment and conscience approve : without partiality and without hypocrisy, let him speak the truth in love. Nor should it be denied that the baptists have as much right to the exercise of private judgment, in all its extent, as any other denomination of Christians.*

* The doctrine of *implicit faith* has been well exposed by the late Dr. CAMPBELL. "Implicit faith," says he, "has been sometimes ludicrously styled *fides carbonaria*, from the noted story of one, who, examining an ignorant collier on his religious principles, asked him what it was that he believed ? He answered, 'I believe what the church believes.' The other rejoined, 'What then does the church believe ?' He replied readily, 'The church believes what I believe.' The other, desirous, if possible, to bring him to particulars, once more resumes his inquiry ;—'Tell me then, I pray

But is it necessary that a difference of sentiment, with reference to baptism, should destroy all Christian communion? Surely not. Then let all the disciples of Jesus shew that they love one another with a pure heart fervently, though they cannot be of one mind in some particulars of importance. It is a good remark of the celebrated PHILIP HENRY, that "it is not so much our difference of opinion that doth us the mischief, as the mismanagement of that difference." See the publications of the Religious Tract Society, No. 19. There is nothing to hinder baptists and pædobaptists from holding godly conversation together in private, or joining in the prayers and praises of social worship. Nor is it absolutely necessary that their difference of judgment before mentioned, should prevent their uniting in a prayer-meeting, or in the establishment of a charity-school. Christians of different denominations may make a very powerful and united attack upon the kingdom of darkness, by circulating small tracts, containing the first principles of the oracles of God, and those great outlines of the gospel-system in which they are heartily agreed. In this view, the institution for religious tracts appears to be worthy of every recommendation. Let the baptist and the pædobaptist take a walk together to the Depository, No. 10, Stationer's Court, from which two or three millions of tracts have already issued. Let them unite with those who are labouring to counteract all that is profane, and all that is obscene, in the publications vended by hawkers and pedlars, in which many thousand pounds are annually spent, and by which, it is justly feared, multitudes of the rising generation are deeply corrupted. To conclude: let Christians of

you, what it is which you and the church both believe?" The only answer the collier could give, was, 'Why truly, Sir, the church and I both believe the same thing.' Lectures on Eccl. History, vol. ii. p. 259.

all denominations unite in circulating *Bibles*:—the Society for promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor,—the Naval and Military Bible Society,—the British and Foreign Bible Society, all demand, and should receive, wherever the ability is found, the most cordial assistance of those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

THE END.

63-201

[The following page contains extremely faint, illegible text.]

Chalk, 1880-1881